DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 984 HE 023 145

AUTHOR Roney, Robert K.
TITLE Results of 1989 Study at the University of Tennessee: Concerns of College of Education Graduate Students.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Little Rock, AR, November 9, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; College Curriculum; College Faculty; *Education Majors; Facilities; Faculty Advisers; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Racial Differences; Schools of Education; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS *University of Tennessee

ABSTRACT

A survey of University of Tennessee College of Education graduate students (N=353) examined their attitudes toward faculty, curriculum, personal satisfaction, facilities, and administration. Students in all seven departmental groups rated faculty as most satisfactory and administration as least satisfactory. One administration item was rated positively (registration); financial aid items were rated least favorably among administration items. Comparison of doctoral with MS/EdS students found few differences. Highest rated items were advisor's knowledge, knowledge of other departmental faculty, advisor's helpfulness, instruction by advisor, and advisor's availability. Other findings included acceptability on most curriculum items and a high degree of personal satisfaction. Parking was rated the most negatively on the entire survey. Findings were also evaluated in terms of demographic groups including gender, race, graduate assistant status, age, type of doctoral program, and full-time/part-time status. Among the demographic findings, there was significantly more overall agreement between males and females than between blacks and whites. The survey is appended. (DB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED314984

# RESULTS OF 1989 STUDY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE: CONCERNS OF COLLEGE OF EDUCATION GRADUATE STUDENTS

PRESENTED AS A PART OF A SYMPOSIUM AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
MID-SOUTH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS
NOVEMBER 9, 1989

BY
ROBERT K. RONEY, PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert K. Roney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 023 145

# RESULTS OF 1989 STUDY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE: CONCERNS OF COLLEGE OF EDUCATION GRADUATE STUDENTS

By

Robert K. Roney, Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The three papers presented by Fowler, Reaves, and Gettys as a part of this symposium described in detail the methodology used to ascertain the assessment and concerns of College of Education graduate students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK), in the Spring of 1989. They emphasized the need for similar studies undertaken at other institutions to begin with the same or similar methods to determine the appropriate questions to ask of the students at a particular school. The research team believes strongly that this is an important point which must not be ignored by others who wish to investigate their students' concerns.

The purpose of this paper is to share some of the findings of the survey at The University of Tennessee. Since a cluster sample was used for the study, data are presented in descriptive form only. And because a part of the assurance to the various departments was that of anonymity, the data are reported in percents, rather than in frequency counts, so that the relative size of the units' responses would not be revealed. This should prevent speculation as to which department was the subject of a particular part of the report. Only the department heads were told which of the randomly lettered designations identified their own department.

## FINDINGS

Overall Results: The graduate students enrolled in the UTK College of Education in the Spring of 1989 were most satisfied with the faculty they encountered in their programs (M=3.49). The other four dimensions were in order: curriculum (M=3.11), personal satisfaction (M=3.07), facilities (M=2.83), and administration (M=2.40). On the 5-point Likert scale anything below 3.0 is below acceptable. The items which made up these scales were:

Faculty--questions 17-24 (19 items),
Curriculum--questions 8-16 (17 items),
Personal satisfaction--questions 33-35 (4 items),
Facilities--questions 25-32 (24 items),
Administration--questions 1-7 (13 items). (See questionnaire in the Appendix.)

Table 1 displays the means for these scaled categories for each of the departments and for the entire college. While there were 408 total responses, the means for individual items were usually based on fewer responses than that number since "no opinion" or "not applicable" were possible choices.

Table 1

Student Means for the Five Sub-scales of Areas of Concern, UTK College of Education, Spring 1989

| Department | Areas Admin. | Curr. | Faculty | Facil. | Pers. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 2.64 | 3.34 | 3.64 | 2.79 | 3.27 |
| B | 2.30 | 3.07 | 3.35 | 2.89 | 3.12 |
| C | 2.11 | 2.37 | 3.47 | 2.64 | 2.83 |
| D | 2.33 | 3.22 | 3.59 | 2.87 | 3.16 |
| E | 2.43 | 3.16 | 3.36 | 3.13 | 3.04 |
| F | 2.48 | 2.90 | 3.38 | 2.53 | 2.90 |
| G | 2.57 | 3.09 | 3.86 | 3.01 | 3.06 |
| Others | 2.42 | 2.65 | 3.25 | 2.88 | 2.68 |
| COLLEGE | **2.40** | **3.11** | **3.49** | **2.83** | **3.07** |

All departmental groups (including those in "others", who were primarily students from other colleges and those who had not decided on a program) were in agreement on their highest and lowest categories--faculty and administration respectively. It must be noted that even for the highest scales for all groups no rating averaged as high as 4.0 on the 5-point scale, leaving considerable room for improvement.

When the five major areas of concern were divided into the individual items, further insights into student concerns could be studied. Table 2 presents the means for each item in the questionnaire for all students and for doctoral (N=145) and MS/EdS (N=208) students as separate groups. Students from other colleges and those who had not been admitted to a degree program are included in the college means but not in the degree groups. Items are abbreviated in the table. For complete item wording, see the questionnaire in the Appendix.

One item in the administrative area (registration) was given a positive rating (3.37). Only three others (admissions clarity --3.12, admissions efficiency--3.05, and tuition--2.80) were near the acceptable level. All other administrative items were negative, with financial aid items being the most negative. A comparison of the doctoral and the MS/EdS students reveals that

Table 2

Item Means in Five Areas of Concern,
UTK College of Education, Spring 1989

| Areas/Items | College Means | Doctoral Students' Means | MS/EdS Students' Means |
|---|---|---|---|
| Administration (Questions 1-7) | | | |
| Admissions clarity | 3.12 | 3.19 | 3.06 |
| Admiss. efficiency | 3.05 | 3.06 | 3.03 |
| Student orientation | 2.33 | 2.33 | 2.27 |
| Registration | 3.37 | 3.48 | 3.24 |
| Reasonable tuition | 2.80 | 2.94 | 2.70 |
| Student act. fee | 2.44 | 2.47 | 2.36 |
| Fin. aid publicity | 1.99 | 1.90 | 1.89 |
| Fin. aid available | 2.02 | 1.89 | 1.98 |
| Fin. aid amounts | 2.09 | 1.92 | 2.08 |
| Fin. aid counseling | 2.20 | 2.04 | 2.22 |
| Assist'ships avail. | 2.64 | 2.52 | 2.67 |
| Assist'ships amt. | 2.39 | 2.14 | 2.56 |
| Placement services | 2.51 | 2.40 | 2.53 |
| Curriculum (Questions 8-16) | | | |
| Major course qual. | 3.63 | 3.69 | 3.63 |
| Oth. COE courses | 3.38 | 3.36 | 3.43 |
| Courses outside COE | 3.59 | 3.73 | 3.51 |
| Course relevance | 3.53 | 3.64 | 3.52 |
| Course frequency | 2.83 | 2.97 | 2.72 |
| Time courses offer. | 2.94 | 3.06 | 2.84 |
| No content dupl. | 3.15 | 3.13 | 3.18 |
| Theoretical content | 3.52 | 3.58 | 3.54 |
| Practical content | 3.32 | 3.35 | 3.36 |
| Balance theo-pract. | 3.29 | 3.39 | 3.26 |
| Summer course avil. | 2.56 | 2.66 | 2.49 |
| Emph. on writing | 3.37 | 3.44 | 3.37 |
| Emph. on "hands-on" | 2.97 | 2.95 | 2.99 |
| Grading | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.51 |
| Clear prog. requir. | 3.32 | 3.25 | 3.40 |
| Doc. resid. requir. | 2.79 | 2.81 | 2.65 |
| Doc. seminars | 2.74 | 2.67 | 2.95 |
| Faculty (Questions 17-24) | | | |
| Advisor's available | 3.82 | 4.03 | 3.69 |
| Adv. helpfulness | 3.96 | 4.11 | 3.88 |
| Adv. knowledge | 4.22 | 4.37 | 4.14 |
| Adv. mentoring | 3.74 | 3.86 | 3.67 |
| Adv. instruction | 3.95 | 4.12 | 3.83 |
| Adv. involv. res. | 3.34 | 3.57 | 3.10 |
| Adv. involv. prof. | 3.36 | 3.42 | 3.28 |
| Adv. involv. publ. | 3.22 | 3.27 | 3.12 |
| Dept. prof. avail. | 3.57 | 3.59 | 3.55 |
| Dept. prof. knowl. | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.98 |

Table 2 (continued)

Item Means ...

| Areas/Items | College Means | Doctoral Students' Means | MS/EdS Students' Means |
|---|---|---|---|
| Faculty (continued) | | | |
| Dept. prof. instr. | 3.76 | 3.75 | 3.76 |
| Dept. prof. res. | 3.13 | 2.98 | 3.21 |
| Oth. prof. avail. | 3.31 | 3.31 | 3.30 |
| Oth. prof. know. | 3.74 | 3.80 | 3.72 |
| Oth. prof. instr. | 3.55 | 3.59 | 3.53 |
| Fac/stud. interact. | 3.23 | 3.17 | 3.26 |
| Psyc. support | 3.35 | 3.26 | 3.38 |
| Advisement | 3.26 | 3.17 | 3.34 |
| Career guidance | 2.89 | 2.87 | 2.93 |
| Facilities (Questions 25-32) | | | |
| Classrooms/labs | 3.19 | 3.11 | 3.25 |
| Furniture | 3.08 | 2.97 | 3.14 |
| Student offices | 2.88 | 2.73 | 2.93 |
| Student lounges | 2.76 | 2.56 | 2.86 |
| Student storage | 2.49 | 2.45 | 2.46 |
| Athletic/recreation | 3.53 | 3.52 | 3.49 |
| Cleanliness | 3.46 | 3.45 | 3.50 |
| Day parking | 1.40 | 1.39 | 1.35 |
| Evening parking | 2.70 | 2.67 | 2.67 |
| GA parking | 1.63 | 1.51 | 1.50 |
| Equipment | 3.10 | 3.05 | 3.12 |
| Microcomputers | 3.05 | 3.15 | 2.92 |
| Library collection | 3.53 | 3.36 | 3.64 |
| Library hours | 3.74 | 3.69 | 3.75 |
| Library orientation | 3.49 | 3.65 | 3.38 |
| Library staff | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.89 |
| Library parking | 1.93 | 1.78 | 1.87 |
| Vending areas | 3.14 | 3.12 | 3.12 |
| Cafeteria conven. | 3.26 | 3.37 | 3.16 |
| Cafe. food quality | 2.96 | 3.04 | 2.86 |
| Cafeteria hours | 3.10 | 3.12 | 3.07 |
| Cafe. attractive | 2.93 | 2.91 | 2.91 |
| Adequate housing | 2.91 | 2.94 | 2.77 |
| Access to housing | 3.01 | 3.08 | 2.85 |
| Personal concerns (Questions 33-35) | | | |
| Stud-stud. interact. | 3.08 | 3.01 | 3.10 |
| Tailored program | 3.06 | 3.15 | 2.97 |
| Social time | 2.95 | 2.88 | 2.95 |
| Course req. time | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.15 |

the two groups were in agreement on the administrative items except for tuition and course frequency, where the doctoral students were more positive.

The curriculum items were rated acceptable or better except for the summer term course availability (2.56), doctoral residency requirements (2.79), and doctoral seminars (2.74). Doctoral students were more positive about course frequency and the residency requirement and less positive about doctoral seminars than were MS/EdS students. The highest rated items in the curriculum area were quality of the major courses (3.63), quality of courses taken outside the College (3.59), course relevance (3.53), theoretical content of courses (3.52), and grading practices (3.52).

As previously mentioned, the faculty received the highest ratings. The weakest rated items for faculty were departmental faculty involvement of non-advisees in their research (3.13) and career guidance from faculty (2.89), both of which were in the acceptable range. Highest rated items were advisor's knowledge (4.22), knowledge of other departmental faculty (3.99), advisor's helpfulness (3.96), instruction by advisor (3.95), and advisor's availability (3.82). Doctoral students were more positive than were MS/EdS students on most items. Exceptions were willingness of non-advisors in the department to involve them in research, faculty-student interaction, psychological support from the faculty and peers, and the quality of advisement. It is possible that expectations (with less than complete fulfillment) of doctoral students in these areas are higher, and therefore they rated the items lower.

As might have been predicted, parking was the lowest area, not only for the facilities section but also for the entire survey. While it could have been argued that there was no need to include such items since there is little likelihood that anything can be done about the problem by the College, the omission of this topic would have caused the survey to lack credibility with student respondents; since parking IS the number one problem encountered by most students at UT and most other large universities. Library items (except parking), athletic/recreation facilities, and cleanliness of facilities were given the highest ratings (all above 3.40). In addition to parking (Day parking was 1.40 and graduate assistant parking was 1.63.), student storage for materials (2.49) and student lounges (2.76) were given the weakest ratings. Doctoral students were more negative about classroom and lab facilities, student offices, and student lounges than were the MS/EdS students. The reverse was true for cafeteria convenience and adequacy of campus housing.

The final area addressed was the students' personal concerns. All four items in this area were given adequate or slightly higher ratings. The strongest score was for time to complete course requirements (3.23), although the MS/EdS students (3.15) rated the item lower than did the doctoral students (3.33). At least part of the explanation for this difference is related to the fact that many of the MS/EdS students are part-time, while the doctoral students are more likely to be full-time.

Demographic Groups: Several major demographic groups were compared to ascertain if there were different concerns among the several groups. For discussion purposes, means closer than .20 were considered in agreement. Based on this criterion, males and females agreed on all except 11 of the 77 items. However, blacks and whites were more than .20 apart on 31 items and GAs differed from non-GAs on 20.

Gender. In the administrative area, both women and men indicated that they felt that the tuition and the four financial aid questions were less than acceptable; however, the female students were more negative than their male counterparts on all five items. There were only two differences in the curriculum area. Women students rated "hands-on" emphasis higher than did the men, although both groups rated this aspect of their courses in the acceptable range. Women rated the doctoral seminars as less than acceptable, while the men put them in the acceptable range. There were no differences of .20 or more in the female/male ratings on the faculty items. Men rated four of the facility items higher than did the women--GA parking, library staff, adequacy of housing, and access to housing. In all four cases the ratings were in the same direction on the scale with only a difference in strength of the rating. There were also no differences in the personal concerns area.

Race. In the administrative area, black students were more positive than white students on three items. (Races other than black and white were not calculated because there were only ten students, half of whom left the item blank, who were not in these two categories.) Blacks were more positive on financial aid publicity and availability and on assistantship availability. Neither group gave these items high ratings, although the black group put the assistantship availability in the acceptable range. There were differences on five items in the curriculum area. White students rated all five higher than did black students. The areas were courses outside the college, times courses are offered, summer course availability, emphasis on "hands-on" activities, and value of the doctoral seminars. Black and white students differed on seven of the items regarding the faculty,

with the white students giving the faculty higher ratings on six of these items than did the black students. Items rated higher by the whites were advisor involvement of student in research, availability to students of professors from other departments, knowledge of professors from other departments, instructional quality of professors from other departments, faculty-student interaction, and psychological support. The item where the black students gave the faculty a higher rating than did the white students was advisor involvement of student in professional activities. There were 13 items where these groups differed on facilities issues--ten where black students were more positive and three where white students were more positive. Blacks gave higher ratings to classrooms, student offices, building cleanliness, library collection, library hours, library staff, cafeteria food quality, cafeteria attractiveness, adequacy of student housing, and access to student housing. Whites gave higher scores to student storage, athletic-recreational facilities, and daytime parking. In most of these cases there was agreement in direction but differences in strength of feeling. For example, library issues received positive ratings from both groups and parking was rated low by both. Finally, the two groups differed on three of the four personal concerns items, with white students rating student-student interaction, program tailoring, and time for socialization higher than did the black students.

Graduate Assistant status. Non-graduate assistants gave the administration higher marks on admissions matters than did GAs, but on orientation, financial aid, assistantships, and placement services the GAs gave the higher scores. The only item in the curriculum area where there was a difference was the value of the doctoral seminars, with the non-GAs rating them in the acceptable range, while the GAs were more negative about them. GAs felt their advisors involved them in research and in professional activities more than did non-GAs. There were ten items where these two groups differed on facilities items, with each group giving higher ratings to five of them. GAs scored student storage, library staff, cafeteria convenience, cafeteria hours, and access to housing higher than non-GAs. Conversely, non-GAs scored student lounges, evening parking, GA parking, library collection, and library parking higher than did GAs. Most of these differences seem entirely logical in light of the different use of facilities GAs and non-GAs routinely make. Non-GAs were more positive than GAs about the time they had for both socializing and for completion of course requirements. Again, this seems a reasonable reflection of the expectations made on GAs' time for their duties in the College. When asked about whether or not they would be willing to pay extra for the privilege of parking in a lot for graduate students closer to the

center of the campus, GAs or students employed on UT-related projects responded 45.1%--yes, 33.6%--no, and 21.3%--not sure. Graduate students who were not employed as GAs or on other UT-related projects responded 37.6%--yes, 33.9%--no, and 28.5%--not sure. Several of those in each group who responded "no" commented that they thought they already paid too much to park.

Age. Respondents were asked to indicate membership in one of five age groups. Since there were only five respondents who fell in the over 55 age group, that category was combined with the 46-54 age group to form the over 45 group. Four students left the age item blank. For only three items were there consistent patterns of relative strength of responses as the ages of the respondents changed. In all three cases--advisor involvement of students in publications and presentations, library orientation, and library staff--the ratings increased for each succeeding age group, although the differences were not extreme. For most items, the over 45 age group was the most positive; while the 36-45 age group was the least positive.

Type Doctoral Program. There were 69 responses from PhD students and 76 from EdD students. PhD students seemed more positive than EdD students about the administrative items, although only four of the 13 items averaged above 2.80 and only one was above 3.20 for the PhDs. PhD students were also slightly more positive toward the faculty than were EdD students, especially in the areas of advisor involvement in professional matters and publication and in their departmental faculty's involvement of them in research. EdD students were more positive about their curriculum, the facilities, and personal concerns than were PhD students. Most noticeable differences in the curriculum area were higher ratings by EdD students of courses in the College of Education, emphasis on writing, and clarity of course requirements. In the personal concerns category EdD students were more positive about the tailoring of their programs and time to complete their course requirements.

Full-time/Part-time Status. It has often been speculated that part-time students have different problems than do full-time students. There were approximately equal numbers of each group who responded. Of the 47 items selected for this comparison, only 5 of the means were more than .20 apart. All of these items were given more positive scores by the part-time students than the full-time students. The five areas were lack of course content duplication, involvement of student with major professor in research, adequacy of library collection, parking near the library, and time to socialize. As was the case with the doctoral students/master's students comparisons made above, expectation levels may explain these differences as much as or more than actual conditions.

APPENDIX

## GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY

## UTK COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This survey is part of a study to determine student satisfaction and concerns with graduate education in the College of Education at UTK. The results are intended to produce recommendations for ways to improve the quality of graduate student life. Your anonymous, candid responses will be appreciated. Participation is voluntary, but we hope you will give us your opinions. Reports will be made to each department and to the college administration in such a way that individuals cannot be identified. Departmental data will be reported in such a way that only the departments themselves will know which is their unit.

Please circle the number on the 1 - 5 scale for each item below where 1 = Needs extensive improvement, 3 = Acceptable, and 5 = Very good. If you have no opinion (NO) or an item is not applicable (NA) to you, check the blank at the right of each scale. **THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.**

| | Needs Extensive Improvement | | Is Acceptable | | Is Very Good | NO or NA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The admissions process | | | | | | |
| a. clarity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. efficiency | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 2. Orientation of new students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 3. Course registration efficiency | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 4. Reasonableness of fees | | | | | | |
| a. tuition/maintenance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. student activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 5. Financial aid | | | | | | |
| a. publicity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. availability of grants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. size of grants | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. counseling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 6. Dept./college assistantships | | | | | | |
| a. availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. amount paid | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 7. Job placement services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 8. Course quality in major | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |

**CONTINUE ON BACK**

| | Needs Extensive Improvement | | Is Acceptable | | Is Very Good | NO or NA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. Course quality in other College of Education departments | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 10. Course quality outside College of Education | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 11. Graduate courses at UTK | | | | | | |
| a. relevance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. frequency of offering | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. times offered | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. avoidance of content duplication | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| e. theoretical content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| f. practical content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| g. balanced between the theoretical & practical | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| h. summer term availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 12. Emphasis on writing activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 13. Emphasis on "Hands-On" experiences | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 14. Grading | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 15. Clarity of program requirements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 16. Doctoral | | | | | | |
| a. residency requirements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. seminars | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 17. My Advisor's | | | | | | |
| a. availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. helpfulness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. knowledge of field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. mentoring | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| e. instruction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 18. Degree to which my major professor involves me in | | | | | | |
| a. research | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. other professional activities/associations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. publications/presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |

**GO TO NEXT PAGE**

| | Needs Extensive Improvement | | Is Acceptable | | Is Very Good | NO or NA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. Other professors in my department | | | | | | |
| a. availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. knowledge of field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. as instructors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. involve students in their research | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 20. Professors in other departments in the college | | | | | | |
| a. availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. knowledge of field | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. as instructors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 21. Opportunities for faculty-student interaction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 22. Psychological support from faculty and peers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 23. Advisement (direction of program) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 24. Career guidance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 25. Facilities (buildings) | | | | | | |
| a. classrooms and labs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. classroom furniture | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. student offices | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. student lounges | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| e. secure storage for student materials | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| f. athletic/recreational facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| g. cleanliness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 26. Parking | | | | | | |
| a. during the day | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. evenings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 27. Parking for GA's/students working on UT-sponsored projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |

**CONTINUE ON BACK**

| | Needs Extensive Improvement | | Is Acceptable | | Is Very Good | NO or NA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. Equipment | | | | | | |
| a. in classrooms and labs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. microcomputer availability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 29. The Library | | | | | | |
| a. adequacy of collection | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. hours | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. orientation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. knowledgeable and helpful staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| e. nearby parking | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 30. Vending areas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 31. On-Campus eating facilities | | | | | | |
| a. convenience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. food quality | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| c. hours | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| d. attractiveness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 32. Housing for graduate students | | | | | | |
| a. adequacy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. access | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 33. Opportunities for student-student interactions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 34. Tailoring of academic programs to student needs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| 35. Sufficient time | | | | | | |
| a. for social interaction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |
| b. to complete course requirements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ___ |

**Please also complete the following personal items to help us interpret the responses to the previous assessments.**

36. Your degree program:
___ 1. Ph.D.
___ 2. Ed.D.
___ 3. Ed.S.
___ 4. M.S.
___ 5. Certification
___ 6. Unclassified
___ 7. Other, Specify _____

**GO TO NEXT PAGE**

37. Major department
___ 1. Art and Music Education
___ 2. Curriculum and Instruction
___ 3. Educational and Counseling Psychology
___ 4. Educational Leadership
___ 5. Health, Leisure, and Safety
___ 6. Physical Education and Dance
___ 7. Special Services Education
___ 8. Technological and Adult Education
___ 9. Other, Specify _____

38. Do you have a major advisor designated?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

If yes, approximately how many hours had you completed when advisor was designated?_____

39. Number of hours enrolled for this semester
___ 1. fewer than 4
___ 2. 4-6
___ 3. 7-9
___ 4. more than 9

40. Number semester hours completed prior to this term in major
___ 1. fewer than 12
___ 2. 12-24
___ 3. more than 24

41. Number UTK graduate semester hours completed prior to this term in College of Education departments other than major
___ 1. fewer than 6
___ 2. 6-12
___ 3. more than 12

42. Number of UTK graduate semester hours completed prior to this term outside the College of Education

___ 1. fewer than 6
___ 2. 6-12
___ 3. more than 12

43. Are you a graduate assistant?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

44. Are you employed on a UT-related project?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No

**CONTINUE ON BACK**

45. Would you be willing to pay an additional fee for the privilege of parking in a lot designated for graduate students closer to the campus center?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No
    ___ 3. Not sure

46. Gender
    ___ 1. Female
    ___ 2. Male

47. Racial/Ethnic Group
    ___ 1. Black
    ___ 2. Hispanic
    ___ 3. White
    ___ 4. Other, specify _____

48. Age
    ___ 1. under 26
    ___ 2. 26-35
    ___ 3. 36-45
    ___ 4. 46-55
    ___ 5. over 55

49. Did you come from outside the Knoxville area to attend U.T.?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No

50. Do you live in U.T. housing?
    ___ 1. Yes
    ___ 2. No

51. Additional comments: